



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/701,537	11/05/2003	Purva R. Rajkotia	2003.07.004	8169
23990	7590	04/24/2007	EXAMINER	
DOCKET CLERK P.O. DRAWER 800889 DALLAS, TX 75380			D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	04/24/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/701,537	RAJKOTIA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stephen M. D'Agosta	2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 23-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments, see arguments, filed 3-27-2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 23-24 under USC 103 have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made.

1. The examiner notes that the terms full and reduced slot modes are defined in the applicant's specification as admitted prior art:

[Para #6] "...In the **non-slotted mode**, the mobile station monitors all paging channel slots for messages from the base station. In the **slotted mode**, the mobile station only monitors a selected subset of the paging channel slots for messages from the base station. During time periods when the mobile station is not monitoring the selected subset of paging channel slots, power is turned OFF to the receiver circuits in the mobile station in order to save additional power".

The examiner further notes that if a device has only two states (eg. slotted or non-slotted), then disabling the one state will inherently mean that the device is operating in the other state (eg. as per claim 23).

Further to this point, Raith teaches a mobile unit being in either slotted or non-slotted mode.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir.

1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-24 rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-21 of U.S. Patent No. 6,522,873. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both describe controlling the slotted and non-slotted modes of a mobile phone communicating with a base station.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 23-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kinnavy US 2003/0114156 and Brilla et al. US 6,389,276.

As per **claims 23-24**, Kinnavy teaches a mobile station for communicating with a base station of a wireless network, said mobile station capable of operating in a full slot cycle mode and a reduced slot cycle mode (figure 4 shows the mobile receiving control

Art Unit: 2617

information for slot cycle AND (figure 4 shows the system, eg. controller, adjusting the slot cycle to a preferred slot cycle in response to a generic trigger event. Also see Para #11);

But is silent on

wherein said mobile station is capable of receiving from said base station a first control message indicating that the reduced slot cycle mode is disabled in said base station and,

in response to said first control message, said mobile station operates only in the full slot cycle mode.

Brilla teaches the BTS sending configuration information/messages to the mobile in order to change it's operation between slotted and non-slotted modes:

“..The mobile telephone 122, upon initializing for operation in a CDMA system, acquires the pilot channel of the cell site, obtains system configuration and timing information for the CDMA system, and begins monitoring the CDMA paging channels. In particular, the mobile station may perform paging channel monitoring procedures while in an idle state. The mobile station 122 may operate in a slotted mode, where only selected slots (e.g., one or two slots per slot cycle) are monitored on the paging channel. Alternatively, the mobile station 122 may monitor all paging and control channels if operating in a non-slotted mode. In either case, the mobile station 122 monitors the paging and control channels for a command, and transmits an acknowledgement upon receiving any message that is addressed to the mobile station 122”. C12, L44-58

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Kinnavy, such that wherein said mobile station is capable of receiving from said base station a first control message indicating that the reduced slot cycle mode is disabled in said base station AND in response to said first control message, said mobile

Art Unit: 2617

station operates only in the full slot cycle mode, to provide means for setting the slot cycle to save power.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-22 are allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. D'Agosta whose telephone number is 571-272-7862. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8am to 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bill Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

STEVE M. D'AGOSTA
PRIMARY EXAMINER



4-10-07